



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RR

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,168	11/06/2000	David Cameron	97-1165	8164
23413	7590	11/03/2003		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			EXAMINER ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT 2839	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707168

Applicant

Examiner

N. Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-14-03 (c/m 8-11)
- ☒ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 26-55, 57-61, 65-68 is/are pending in the application.
- ☒ Of the above claim(s) 57-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 26-55 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 61, 65-68 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Abstract again objected to as insufficient to describe the invention. It should be amended to include material as suggested in last office action but without use of numerals.

Claims 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 65, line 12 "connector" seems incorrect, should it be --conductor--; claim 67 dependency is incorrect.

Claim 66 is unclear, it could be amended as follows, line 3 delete "and", below line 3 add, --removing the second section while leaving the third section in position in the wet downhole environment--, line 4 change "separate" to --replacement--, after "engaging" add --an end of said second section to--, line 5 after "section" add --in the wet downhole environment--.

Non-elected claims 57-60 should be canceled in next response.

Last amendment is improper for omission of claim 61 in the claim listing. It appears that intent was to cancel claim 61; see page 12, lines 25, 26.

Since status is unclear, all rejections of claim 61 in prior office action are repeated and incorporated into this letter.

Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevalier in view of Cunningham.

Art Unit: 2839

Chevalier discloses a method of joining pipe including use of first section 10, second section 11 and third section 13 with electrical connection between first connector 17 and third connector 40.

It seems obvious that tube 10 could be in a well hole and tube 11 with section (adapter) 13 attached could be lowered into the hole for attachment. See orientation in fig. 2. In addition, Cunningham shows pipe sections joined in the well hole to be known. Obvious to so join the Chevalier pipe sections. This would be necessary since drill strings are often thousands of feet long, Cunningham, col. 1, lines 15-118.

Claims 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chevalier in view of Cunningham and Basuttil.

Chevalier does not disclose use of a flushing step. Basuttil discloses use of oil, grease for purging. It would have been obvious to use such step in Chevalier to clean debris from the contacts. Even apart from Basuttil, flushing steps are seen to be admittedly known for use in drill pipe electrical connections.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment and pertinent to above rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument regarding Chevalier are not understood. The entire pipe length if very long could not be built out of the well. It seems obvious that parts 10, 12 could be located in the well hole and then attached parts 11, 13 dropped into the well to be joined to parts 10, 12.

Art Unit: 2839

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claim 26, lines 18, 19, reference to "separation of third and second sections" while in the "wet location" in context of other claim 26 features overcomes prior art. For Chevalier parts 11, 13 held ~~by~~ bolts 51 are not so removable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 26-55 are allowed.

Claims 66 with suggested changes to claims 65 and 66 would overcome prior art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/707,168


Page 5

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number 308-1729.

Abrams/ek

10/29/03


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322